DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 378 TE 001 098

By-Filburn, Eleanor

Student Teaching: Whose Responsibility?

Pub Date 68

Note-14p.; In "The Growing Edges of Secondary English: Essays by the Experienced Teacher Fellows at the University of Illinois 1966-1967," ed. Charles Suhor and others (Champaign: NCTE, 1968), pp. 188-200.

Available from-National Council of Teachers of English, 508 South Sixth Street, Champaign, Ill. 61820 (Stock No. 02455, HC $2.95).

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.

Descriptors-Affiliated Schools, *College Supervisors, *Cooperating Teachers, Evaluation Techniques, Microteaching, Preservice Education, Professional Education, Student Teachers, *Student Teaching, *Supervisory Methods, Systems Analysis, Tape Recorders, *Teacher Evaluation, Teacher Supervision, Teaching Styles, Television, Universities

Cooperating teachers, college supervisors, and student teachers must work as a team to plan student-teaching programs which will provide opportunities for evaluating teacher performance and subject matter competence and which will encourage individual teaching styles. The evaluation of student-teacher performance can be improved by three-way conferences in which the supervisor and cooperating teacher involve the student teacher in evaluating himself. Also, use can be made of an evaluation procedure like that suggested by Curtis and Andrews, in which the cooperating teacher supplies evidence to help the supervisor grade the student teacher. Promising trends in the supervision of student teaching include the use of a team of supervisors (a subject matter specialist and an education specialist), the provision of such "pre-student teaching" experiences as microteaching, and the employment of television, tape recordings, or formal systems (e.g., Flanders' system of interaction analysis) for the analysis of behavior during student teaching. Despite the improvements, the student teaching situation is far from ideal and can be further improved only through cooperation between the universities and the public schools. (JS)

ED026378

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The Growing Edges of Secondary English

Essays by the Experienced Teacher Fellows at the University of Illinois 1966-1967

Editors:
Charles Suhor
John Sawyer Mayher
Frank J. D'Angelo

TE 001 098

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH
508 South Sixth Street **Champaign, Illinois 61820**

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY NCTE and Eleanor Filburn TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

STUDENT TEACHING: WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY?

by ELEANOR FILBURN

Miss Filburn received a B.S. from State University College, Oneonta, New York, and an M.A. from Columbia University. She has done graduate work at Syracuse University, the University of Wisconsin, and Duke University. She has taught in elementary and secondary schools in New York State and is now Associate Professor of Education at State University College, Oswego, New York. She here presents an approach to the supervision of student teachers. Not only does she identify some of the chaotic conditions in student teaching, she also indicates a new shift in responsibilities for student teaching.

Student teaching is widely regarded as one of the most vital and dynamic parts of any teacher education program. Despite the lack of conclusive research to support the value of such experiences, they are assumed to be the indispensable part of teacher preparation. Student teaching can be viewed as a time for guided integration of academic and professional courses. Here a student tries to blend the educational theory and the subject matter knowledge presented by the college into a compatible working relationship with education as it is and can be in schools. Ideally, student teaching, concomitant with the methods course, should provide opportunities for the analysis and evaluation of the teaching performance, for the beginning development of professional skills, for the building of a rationale for one's professional role, and for the development of an individual teaching style. To do this successfully, a team approach is needed—a team consisting of student teacher, cooperating teacher, and college supervisor.

Student teaching for the prospective teacher of English should provide the answers to two questions: *Does the teacher know his subject?* and *Can he teach it?* The college student majoring in English can be expected to have some knowledge of the main periods and genres of American and English literature and of representative literary critics, to have a working knowledge of at least two systems of grammar with attention accorded to usage and dialects, and to have internalized the essentials of rhetoric augmented by a familiarity with general semantics. Similarly, the professional education of the English teacher should include a specific English methods course which would analyze the problems and materials of language, literature, and composition; supervised student teaching of English in a secondary school; and some background in learning theory,

in educational psychology, and in aspects of public education related to the content area of English. However, to expect the student teacher to be proficient in all these aspects of teaching is unreasonable. The specific skills and knowledge making up the structure of the teaching of English cannot be acquired quickly; they require development over a long period of time. Student teaching, in this view, is one step in the continuum of the education of English teachers.

STUDENT TEACHING SITUATIONS

The nature of student teaching experiences varies. Generally the student teaching takes place in the last year of a four-year course in an undergraduate teacher education program. Statistics on the length of student teaching fluctuate from a low of one to four weeks to a high of forty-five to forty-nine weeks, with the largest number approximating a college quarter or semester. This may be full-time work or may be somewhere between three and six hours a day, and it may include some course work. Another widely used plan sends the student teacher to the school full-time but for only six or eight weeks.

It is important that all arrangements for student teaching assignments be made and confirmed prior to the arrival of student teachers at a school. A predominant practice is to have student teaching centers in off-campus public schools. An effort should be made to place student teachers in schools where they will best be able to function. For effective placement of student teachers with cooperating teachers, a knowledge of both groups is needed and an understanding of human relations is essential. Examples of poor placement would be placing an extremely shy student teacher with an aggressive cooperating teacher, placing a student with a knowledge of and commitment to transformational grammar in a school system which teaches formalized, traditional grammar, or placing a student with a liberal educational philosophy with an ultraconservative cooperating teacher. It would seem logical to use the combined knowledge of the college supervisory staff and the director of student teaching about the known interests, abilities, and preferences of students plus the accumulated information about cooperating schools and teachers as a basis for placing student teachers in schools.

The Role of the College Supervisor

The college supervisor's role is a complex one which varies from university to university and from college to college. Among the most important functions of the supervisor are aiding in the placement of

student teachers in cooperating schools, acting as a liaison between the institution of higher learning and the public school, working with the student teacher, evaluating the student teacher, and providing educational leadership.

In acting as a liaison, the college supervisor has a serious responsibility to keep communication flowing between the college and the public school. Frequently, schools judge a department or school of education by the college representative with whom they are familiar. College personnel engaging in supervision need to have a thorough understanding of the whole teacher education program and the place of student teaching within the program. This is necessary so that the supervisor can interpret the program to the schools and encourage schools to share in the preparation of teachers. In this role, the supervisor becomes a co-worker with the department chairman and English teachers in guiding student teachers.

An effort should be made to keep persons responsible for teacher education in touch with the problems of student teachers and of teachers in the field. Thus, fellow staff members may rely on the college supervisor to observe and note strengths and weaknesses in the preparation of student teachers as one means of assessing the quality of teacher education and of improving it. The opportunity for the supervisors to "get out into the field" provides the college with evidence of what is occurring in classrooms.

Since the English department chairman is a key person in a cooperating school, some supervisors include regularly scheduled conferences with him as part of their task. This may serve merely as a courteous way of letting the chairman know that the college supervisor is in the building. A much better function is to give the supervisor and the chairman an opportunity to discuss the student teachers assigned to that school. In conjunction with this, the chairman may wish to inform the college supervisor of new English programs, added personnel, extended services, or other information about the school and its program. Through this kind of informal exchange the college supervisor becomes acquainted with the department's philosophy and, in turn, familiarizes the department head with the college's student teaching program.

The strength of the relationship between the cooperating teacher and the college supervisor will depend on the personalities involved. Rapport can be established when both keep in mind their primary purpose of helping the student teacher as effectively as possible. The college may provide a student teaching handbook which usually describes the program and offers guidelines. There may also be special meetings for the cooperating teacher which might include such things

as workshops, seminars, and college courses, as well as an informal sharing of ideas. These group meetings are designed to inform, reassure, and involve the cooperating teacher in the student teaching program. The cooperating teachers need to be oriented in the nature of their responsibilities, to have institutional policies clarified, and to gain some advance knowledge of their student teachers. In addition, the cooperating teacher can be a source of information for the supervisor regarding the school and the duties and privileges of student teachers as part of a particular faculty, and he can provide an insight into the English program at a particular grade level and for different tracks. Together the cooperating teacher and the college supervisor can use a team approach to help the student teacher in a most worthwhile manner.

The Role of the Cooperating Teacher

Much of the success of the student teaching experience rests on the cooperating teacher. He has the day-to-day working relationship with the student teacher. The cooperating teacher assigns specific responsibilities to the student teacher, provides experiences which should be successful, strives to develop in his class an acceptance of the student teacher as a leader, helps the student teacher in planning for effective teaching, and helps in the subsequent evaluation. It is the cooperating teacher who is there when disaster seems imminent. He must know what role he is going to assume. Somehow, the cooperating teacher has to sense how secure the student teacher is, how the student will react to criticism, how immediate assistance will affect overall discipline, how to deal with the many other details that are part of a student teaching experience. The cooperating teacher knows that the student teacher needs time to make his own mistakes and to establish his own leadership. However, the cooperating teacher is still responsible for the learning environment of the pupils.

As those who have had student teachers know, the novice may try to cover too much or too little content at a time. In his overzealousness, he may attempt to "teach" three of Hawthorne's short stories in one class period. The cooperating teacher will want to review with the student teacher the skills involved in close reading of a piece of literature, the necessity for comprehension of the plot, the time needed to discuss symbols, the literary themes being developed, and the comparisons and contrasts among the three stories. Usually the student teacher will perceive his problem and then, with the cooperating teacher's guidance, be able to work out possible revisions for the next day's lesson. By contrast, a student teacher's goal may be to explicate a given poem. However, the

discussion may veer to that of an analogous local situation and the poem is forgotten. Here the cooperating teacher might question the student teacher about the validity of the discussion in light of the goal of the lesson and about the role of the teacher as a discussion leader. While such experiences may be trying, the cooperating teacher's responsibility to the students and their learning necessitates such painstaking introspection with the student teacher.

How is the cooperating teacher remunerated for this herculean task? Hopefully, he has a feeling of satisfaction at having helped in the molding of a prospective teacher and has had a worthwhile personal relationship with the student teacher. Through cooperative teaching, the class may have benefited by having two teachers available to help the students and by diversifying or individualizing the program. The cooperating teacher has the thanks of the college and the college supervisor. In more concrete terms, the teacher may be given a certain number of credit hours of free tuition at the college. However, only a few colleges are able to subsidize such a program with bonus payment. Another suggestion has been made to provide the supervising teachers with salaries and ranks comparable to those of the college staff. A less grandiose plan includes listing of the cooperating teachers in the college catalog. It is quite obvious that, in general, the cooperating teacher receives little recognition for his assistance in the student teaching program. Satisfaction, rather than recognition, is his major reward.

SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION

A general pattern for the beginning student teacher includes observing for several days, assisting with and presenting parts of lessons, and finally assuming full responsibility for teaching the class. Allowances need to be made for differences in cooperating teachers, college supervisors, and student teachers, but the complementing qualities of each need to be utilized. The cooperating teacher is usually more familiar with the available teaching materials and the English curriculum in that school and with the student body than is the college supervisor. The supervisor may be more knowledgeable about new trends in teaching English, means of analyzing the teaching process, and the academic background of the student teacher. The student teacher brings to his role the energy of youth, a willingness to try "the new," and, one hopes, a sound academic and professional training.

An effective tool for communication is the three-way conference involving the student teacher, the cooperating teacher, and the college supervisor. Such conferences assume that the suggestions and problems

of the cooperating teacher who works with the student daily should have priority, that the college supervisor has the responsibility to share problems he senses, and that the student teacher needs to be heard. The college supervisor and the cooperating teacher are acting as counselors. They must judge the student's readiness to profit from constructive criticism. The conference should start with positive comments and/or praise. It is better that they ask probing questions which will help the student teacher evaluate himself and his teaching than to tell him what was good and what needs to be improved. In essence, they are assisting the student to evaluate his performance. Then, when the student teacher is sufficiently involved and sees a necessity for change, the supervisor and teacher's help in planning, getting resources, or suggesting methods will be most helpful. The supervisor and the teacher have to provide the setting for the conference. They should be receptive to the student teacher's needs. Getting the student teacher to talk about his experiences is one way to relax tensions so that real communication will take place.

Evaluation of a student teacher is, for the most part, informal, cooperative, and highly subjective. It should be continuous, as specific as possible, and based upon student growth. This is the area most frustrating to the supervisor, for there are no absolute standards. How does one evaluate the student teacher who progresses slowly until the last two or three weeks? What does one do about the student teacher whose poor personal relationships with the cooperating teacher may have affected his teaching? How does one evaluate the student teacher who was extremely weak, has made continuous progress, but is still weak?

Most sources give little assistance in this area. The most repeated statement is that the college supervisor has the responsibility for assigning the final grade in evaluation. The cooperating teacher should be asked to evaluate the student teacher, not in terms of assigning a grade but in supplying evidence which will support the supervisor's grade. Curtis and Andrews suggested the following evaluation procedure:

1. Secure adequate information about the student teacher. Know him as a person and as a prospective teacher.
2. Assess student records and reports, such as weekly reports or a student analysis of special problems.
3. Use evaluation conferences.
4. Use some rating scale or other evaluative procedure familiar to the student teacher to judge a single lesson or one area of teacher activity.
5. Keep anecdotal records.
6. Have one student teacher evaluate another student teacher.
7. Use a pupil evaluation of the student teacher.
8. Have a midterm evaluation and conference.

9. Have a final evaluation and grading. This includes the written evaluation for official recording and the placement office form.
10. Have a final conference with the student teacher.[1]

For the student teacher of English the information secured would include a realization of strengths and weaknesses in both his teaching skills and his content knowledge of language, literature, and composition. While many colleges and universities use a general rating scale as a means of evaluating student teachers, only a few institutions have developed the more useful rating scale designed to measure competencies within the field of English as a specific content area. A rating scale may be used at a midpoint in the student teaching period to clarify other more informal evaluations. One sound practice is to have the student teacher, the cooperating teacher, and the college supervisor each complete a rating scale and then mutually discuss the various discrepancies that may result from such a procedure. This helps to clarify each person's viewpoint and gives the student teacher time to alter any undesirable practices which may be evident.

TRENDS IN SUPERVISION OF STUDENT TEACHING

Within the field of supervision some recent trends seem to be very promising. The first of these involves the use of a team of supervisors, composed of one specialist in the subject matter field and one education specialist. These two complementing persons should be able to work more effectively with student teachers. The specialist in English is able to focus on the appropriate aspects of the content of English, whereas the education specialist focuses on the skill in the teaching of English. Thus a broader understanding and a more balanced perspective may be achieved.

In addition, many colleges incorporate "pre-student teaching" experiences into their programs for the prospective teacher. At Northwestern University, English education majors in their college years observe English classes being taught. Another plan (used successfully at the University of Illinois) is to have the college student, as part of the English methods course, observe for two weeks the classes which he will be teaching the following semester. Other kinds of pre–student teaching experiences have prospective teachers do some teaching in college freshmen classes or arrange tutoring for high school students needing individual assistance in English or reading.

[1] Dwight K. Curtis and Leonard O. Andrews, *Guiding Your Student Teacher* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1954), p. 292.

More laboratory experiences are being used in the English methods courses. Simulated classroom situations in the form of kinescopes and typescripts are being presented to students. These are particularly useful in analyzing the content of classroom interaction. Another technique is the growing practice of microteaching, where a student teaches a concept to a small group of children. Both of these laboratory experiences have the advantages of attempting to correlate theory and practice and of facilitating the handling of larger numbers of college students. In this way a core of common experiences is formed, which the college supervisor may draw upon during the subsequent student teaching.

The use of television as a supervisory aid during student teaching shows promise. The Hunter College Research Project is one example of the extensive use of video recordings with student teachers. Three approaches to supervision were used. In the first group the supervisor observed in the usual way; in the second, observation was via closed circuit television with a kinescopic film being made of the lesson; the third group used a combination of these two procedures. There was no significant superiority of any one group, but the advantages of the second and third groups included availability for repeated viewings, use of a multiperson or team approach, possibilities for adaptation of the techniques to inservice education, and the opportunity for educators to study and compare classroom behavior.

A less costly endeavor involves the use of the tape recorder, which centers on verbal behavior. The student teacher may use the tape recording as a means of self-evaluation, while the cooperating teacher may use it as the pivotal point of a discussion with the student teacher. The college supervisor might estimate from such recordings the extent to which principles in college courses were being implemented. Both the kinescopes and tape recordings provide the means for a more objective observation and result in a permanent record for evaluation.

There is an increased emphasis upon the study of teaching and the use of systems for analyzing the behavior of the student teacher and the pupils in the classroom. One of the widely known systems is Flanders' system of interaction analysis.[2] The end result is to give the teacher or the student teacher a means to compare his actions with his intentions. An observer classifies the verbal communication going on in the classroom into ten categories at an average rate of one classification every three seconds. Seven categories classify teacher statements, two are for pupils' statements, and one is for silence or confusion. The different periods of

[2] See Ned Flanders, *Teacher Influence and Helping Teachers Change Their Behavior* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1965).

class activity may also be noted (introduction of new material, discussion, administrative routine, seat work, etc.). The tallying requires practice, and instruction must be given in the interpretation of matrices. A matrix provides objective information which can be used by the student teacher to determine whether his verbal behavior is in accord with his goals.

B. Othanel Smith's idea of logical aspects of teaching is another such device.[3] The assumption underlying this thesis is that behavior, when measured by rules of validity and correctness, is logical. The verbal teaching behavior of classroom discussions is broken into pedagogically significant units (definition, explanation, evaluation, etc.), which are then analyzed. Other analysis systems include Bellack's pedagogical moves and teaching cycles, Taba's concept of teaching strategies for cognitive development, the LaGrone plan, and Bloom's taxonomy. On first reading, these systems seem complicated and time-consuming in relation to the results obtained. However, my limited experience with the Flanders system of interaction analysis bears out the theory that these can provide an objective evaluation of a kind of information other than that of the subjective judgments of the cooperating teacher and the college supervisor. Each of these systems is designed to examine particular segments of teaching; none is all-encompassing nor a complete evaluation of teaching.

PROBLEMS AND POTENTIALITIES

Despite these significant contributions, the state of student teaching is far from ideal. Conant and others have remarked that student teaching is one of the most casually conducted phases of teacher education. One student teacher summarized her own and other student experiences in this way: "Usually student teaching is not a well-rounded, consistent experience, but an irregular and not fully developed system." Colleges and universities are increasingly faced with difficulties in finding suitable student teaching centers and in placing student teachers with outstanding teachers of English. The college or university usually has no control over the educational programs of cooperating schools and often has little control over the selection of cooperating teachers. State education departments decry the disparity in the quality of student teaching experiences. However, the greatest burden of these discrepancies and inconsistencies is felt by the teachers in the public schools which assume responsibility for the ever-increasing numbers of student teachers.

[3] See B. Othanel Smith, *et al.*, *A Study of the Logic of Teaching*, USOE Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Project No. 258 (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1962).

Examine the following hypothetical situation. An English department of fifteen teachers has agreed to accept two student teachers from each of three colleges during the fall semester. College D's student teaching program consists of one semester of half-day sessions with the college supervisor coming about four times. College E has one nine-week student teaching program period and requires the college supervisor to observe the student teaching a minimum of two half days. College F has a broken block system requiring four weeks in the fall and four weeks in the winter with no set policy for college supervision, assuming that supervision will occur as needed. Each of the three colleges uses different evaluation report forms and slightly different marking systems. College D pays a flat fee of one hundred dollars per student teacher to the school district; College E lists the names of cooperating teachers in their catalog and has an annual banquet for them; and College F offers a free course at the college to the cooperating teacher. Without belaboring this illustration further, it is evident that this high school English department has undertaken an obligation which can seriously affect the workings and morale of the department itself. Such situations have led some school administrators or department chairmen to refuse to work with student teachers while others have arbitrarily decided to work with one particular college to the exclusion of other colleges, but neither of these solutions acknowledges the problems.

Rather than searching endlessly for immediate solutions for this hypothetical school, more will be gained by reexamining the roles of the institutions involved in the student teaching program. Initially I referred to a team approach in student teaching. The institutions—namely, the colleges and universities and the public schools—are involved in an ongoing program in teacher education. However, the prevalent practice is for each to operate autonomously, with a juncture when the college's program of student teaching is conducted in public schools.

Traditionally, the colleges and universities have assumed responsibility for the academic and professional courses comprising the teacher education program. Within the colleges an antipathy between liberal arts departments and education departments is frequently discernible, resulting in fruitless discussions and ignoring the fact that approximately 75 percent of the courses taken by prospective English teachers are taught by departments other than education departments. Furthermore, if the development of teacher education programs rests solely within an education department, many competent academic people are excluded from participating. Whether one advocates Conant's "all-university approach to teacher education," sees value in English education depart-

ments, or elects to leave the control in the education departments, it is imperative to have cooperative development of teacher education programs. The adding of course after course by either an education department or an English department will not, in itself, result in well-prepared teachers. The highly specialized content knowledge needed by the prospective English teacher has to be supplemented by knowledge of learning theory and instructional methods. Evaluation of present teacher education departments might result in large scale revisions of many college curricula with more clearly defined content and less duplication of learning experiences. The use of public school personnel as consultants in such program development could be invaluable. Such cross-pollination of ideas among teachers, department chairmen, and college faculties should prove productive.

Repeatedly public schools are censured for not rushing to fulfill their professional obligations. This seems to be irrelevant chiding. The public schools are well aware of their responsibilities. Any English department chairman working with novice teachers fully realizes that teacher education extends into the public school and that the education of a professional teacher does not end with the granting of a degree by some college or university. In the same manner, the department or school accepting student teachers is attempting to assume its professional responsibility, but how is this to be accomplished? There are few purposeful and well-developed student teaching programs. The cooperating teachers know that working with student teachers is an added activity in their already busy days and that supervision from the college is often inadequate. Perhaps the reluctance of schools and teachers to assume their roles in teacher education is due in part to the confusing, ill-defined student teaching programs that exist.

A close inspection of the student teaching segment of most teacher education programs reveals an appalling lack of articulation and cooperation between the colleges and the public schools. The first step needed is for the colleges and schools which are acting as student teaching centers to cooperatively develop student teaching programs. Both should be instrumental in establishing policies of minimal standards for student teaching and in upgrading the quality of student teaching. Research and experimentation are needed to determine when student teaching is appropriate, what experiences prospective English teachers need, how long a period of time is useful for student teaching, and what skills and levels of competencies in language, literature, composition, and teaching methodology should be demonstrated. Research programs, such as the Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secon-

dary School English Teachers (ISCPET), are engaged in defining "desirable competencies in teachers of secondary English" and in creating programs which will achieve these competencies.

The effectiveness of these "ideal" programs will depend on the quality of supervision given to student teachers. But, as John Goodlad points out in his article on professional laboratory experiences, neither the method of college supervision nor the particular college supervisor is as important as the cooperating teacher.[4] Most studies show that student teachers change their attitudes in the direction of those held by the cooperating teachers and acquire their practices. Principles of teaching seem to be important only to the extent that they are implemented in practice by student teachers. Thus, the cooperating teachers mold the attitudes and techniques of the student teacher. This is laudable if the cooperating teacher exemplifies the highest qualities of competence to be found in an English teacher. However, the need for larger numbers of cooperating teachers continues, and the difficulties colleges are encountering in placing student teachers in desirable teaching situations seem to refute the previous statement.

The old role of cooperative teachers serving as models to be emulated by student teachers is rapidly becoming outdated. The new "in" model cooperating teacher will be more directly involved in the supervision of student teachers. This will require specific professional qualifications: being an effective English teacher, demonstrating leadership ability, being able to clarify and define the supervisory functions (such as group dynamics, group counseling, supervision of student teachers), and possibly having field experiences in supervising student teachers. Donald Durrell's program at Boston University and the Schenectady-Oswego Project (New York State) are both programs in which large numbers of classroom teachers have received or are receiving professional training in the supervision of student teachers. If this kind of specialized supervisory work is to be carried on with student teachers, it will necessitate lighter teaching loads while these teachers have student teachers. This changed concept of the cooperating teacher's role more truly epitomizes the title of *supervising teacher.*

The college supervisor will spend more time working directly with the cooperating teachers, rather than with the student teachers. The supervisor might well conduct inservice programs for the cooperating teachers in new means of evaluation, simulation techniques, or analyses of teaching. Another function would be to provide regular assistance for

[4] John I. Goodlad, "An Analysis of Professional Laboratory Experiences in the Education of Teachers," *Journal of Teacher Education,* XVI (September 1965), 263–270.

the cooperating teacher. The college supervisor would be a clinical supervisor who would assist the teacher in evaluating the student teacher. Most of these activities would take place in cooperative teaching centers, schools specifically working with a college in teacher education programs. One further change would be to extend college supervision to include the first year of teaching wherever possible.

Lighter teaching loads, the need for increased numbers of supervising teachers, and the necessity of having college supervisors work more closely with schools are more costly than the present procedures. Such financial need is over and above what schools and colleges can provide. Compensation for school and college staff might be procured from state and federal subsidies. School districts might be paid a sum for the semester hours of credit earned by the student teacher, as in California. The supervising teacher in Georgia is paid on the basis of his training in supervision of student teachers. New means of financing student teaching programs must be found if the quality of supervision is to be improved.

Classroom teachers need to be more directly involved in the area of teacher certification. There are no national requirements for teacher certification; thus far, each state has its own. Most states require student teaching, but only three states have laws regulating it.[5] The prevalent requirements of "prescribed courses" seems a doubtful way of insuring quality teachers. If state requirements were to focus on the special methods courses and student teaching, it would be a more realistic means of assessing a prospective teacher's mastery of knowledge of English and skill in the teaching of English. Such a plan would facilitate state-by-state reciprocity of certification. The decision of who should be certified would rest on the recommendations made jointly by cooperating teachers and college supervisors. In this way the public school teachers would have more voice in certification through the cooperating teachers. Then the ultimate test of the teacher education program would be in the classrooms of school districts.

The quality of student teaching experiences depends, in part, upon the college or university assuming responsibility for sound preparation of the student's academic and professional background. It is directly related to the expertise of sufficient numbers of cooperating teachers and college supervisors. Cooperation between the college or university and the public school is imperative if common goals are to be achieved. Through communication and understanding, the key people in student teaching will be involved in the formulation and implementation of dynamic and exciting programs for student teachers.

[5] Donald Sharpe, "Threshold to the Profession," *NEA Journal*, LIV (April 1965), 55.